DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 802 SP 039 358

AUTHOR	Mullen, Laurie
TITLE	Preservice Teachers' Articulations of "Learning To Teach": Competing Perspectives on Teacher Education.
PUB DATE	2000-04-25
NOTE	32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/grants/capacity mullen/AERA2000.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Higher Education; Learning Processes; *Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	Teacher Socialization

ABSTRACT

This study challenged the common phrase "learning to teach" by highlighting the articulations of preservice teachers regarding their understanding of the phrase. It described the ways that one group of preservice teachers defined learning to teach throughout one semester's work in a field-based secondary education course. Data collection involved two interviews with each student teacher, students' course-based journals, and informal discussions and other generated materials (e.g., course papers, e-mails, professional portfolios, and personal Web pages). The results could be separated into issues of content and methodology. Students had difficulty separating learning to teach from the concepts of teaching and teacher. They either negated learning to teach or viewed this process as equivalent to teaching and/or teacher. Most of their definitions were highly fragmented and better described their definition of teacher and teaching. Definitions were refined throughout the semester, but they did not address learning to teach as a distinct phenomenon. The descriptions did not include reference to themselves as agents in the process at all. (Contains 18 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 802

Preservice Teachers' Articulations of "Learning to Teach": Competing Perspectives on Teacher Education

Paper Presentation to the American Educational Research Association

New Orleans, LA

April 25, 2000

Laurie Mullen
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Studies
Ball State University - Teachers College
(765) 285-5461
lmullen@gw.bsu.edu

Paper available at:
http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/grants/capacity/mullen/AERA2000.pdf

SP039358

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Mullen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What does it mean to *learn to teach* and in the current ethos of standardized teaching standards, what is the importance of knowing who is defining this phenomena? Does a global and universal understanding of this phenomena exist? Carter (1990) writes that this phrase sometimes refers to the entire enterprise of teacher education, and at other times to specific components such as teacher knowledge, teacher socialization or specific skill acquisition along with research on inservice teacher education. Carter goes on to suggest that the learning to teach question is "unanswerable at the global level and that what is needed are frameworks focusing on what is learned and how that knowledge is acquired" (p.295). In this vein, Kuzmic (1993) poses the question: Is learning to teach the same as learning about teaching? The former implies following a type of planned methodology of learning while the latter refers to a broader historical and occupational perspective on the profession.

At the risk of delving into "philosophical semantics", I propose that because this phrase embodies implicit and cultural understandings of the purpose and role of teacher education, it deserves specific attention. In their chapter in the Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, Floden and Buchmann (1990) address the problem of "everyday language" as a "repository of human interests (p. 44)." They suggest that unless educators are clear about the point of teaching that "they will remain hopelessly muddled." Has the phrase *learning to teach* taken the status of everyday

language for university and field-based teacher educators and scholars thus showcasing the interests of those left to define it?

In a recent review of the research on learning to teach (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon, 1998), the authors state that *learning to teach* did not exist as a *subject descriptor* in the ERIC database. In order to perform bibliographic searches on this phrase, the authors reported having to use tangential terms such as student teachers, teacher education, among others. However, searching on the phrase *learning to teach* in the ERIC database in journal titles and in article text, is a bit more promising in terms of quantity, however further obfuscates the search for a clear conception of this phrase. Educational journals in the early 1990's contained many articles addressing learning to teach specifically in the title or more peripherally in the subsequent content. The majority of these articles, however, focus on additional phenomena studied such as induction and mentoring in learning to teach (Huling-Austin, 1992) and the role of experience in learning to teach (Munby, 1994).

This paper challenges the common understandings phrase "learning to teach" by highlighting the voices of preservice teachers' articulation and understanding of the phrase in order to capture their unique perspective. Underlying this work is the assumption that language is a constitutive force, creating a particular view of reality and of the Self (Richardson, 1994). I describe the ways that one group of preservice teacher education students define "learning to teach" throughout one semester's work in a field-based

secondary education course. The initial research question guiding the study was: What *is the role of beliefs in learning to teach?* A subsequent question later emerged: *How is learning to teach defined by preservice students and how are these definitions shaped by a program's institutional context?*

Conceptual Framework

I made use of multiple theoretical perspectives in order to frame this inquiry. I begin with a discussion of the literature on the role of attitudes and beliefs in teacher education including the study of images. I follow with a brief discussion of the literature on teacher socialization focusing on the effects of teacher education programs on novice teachers.

The literature on attitudes and beliefs in teacher education and professional development served as the underlying framework for the initial stages of the study. Depending on the author, additional terms used to explain similar constructs are *conceptions, theories, understandings, practical knowledge, images, and values* (Richardson, 1996).

Beliefs are thought to have two functions in learning to teach. The first relates to the constructivist theories of learning that suggest that students bring beliefs to a teacher education program that strongly influence what and how they learn. The second relates to beliefs as the focus of change in the process of education (Richardson, 1996). Green (1971) identified three dimensions of belief systems which address the way in which they are related to one another within the system. First, a belief is never held in total independence of all other beliefs, with some primary beliefs and some

derivative beliefs. The second dimension focuses on the degree of conviction of the belief as either central or peripheral. And the third dimension has to do with the notion that "beliefs are held in clusters, more or less in isolation from other clusters and protected from any relationship with other sets of beliefs" (p. 48). This clustering prevents "cross-fertilization" among clusters of beliefs, which may help to explain inconsistencies among beliefs held by preservice and inservice teachers.

Beliefs in their various forms are sometimes given the status of knowledge. Grossman, Wilson, and Shulman (1989) set out to investigate teachers' knowledge and soon realized that they must consider teacher beliefs. The argument surrounding whether or not beliefs are a form of knowledge - or what teachers take to be knowledge - is useful only as to how the beliefs affect their experience (see Thompson, 1992). Using the term personal knowledge perspective, Clandinin (1986) argues that student teachers have not yet worked out a dynamic relationship between their imagery and other dimensions of their personal knowledge and practices.

Images

Understood as general metaphors for teaching, images can be deeply embedded and powerful factors in the learning to teach process. An image is a highly abstracted term describing how individual teachers think about classroom processes. Clift et al. report how images of self as student, self as teacher of English, and self as student teacher cannot be separated into discreet components for the two student teachers represented in their study. In an

interactive, relational sense, these images have the power to affect an individual's interpretations of experience, but also that experiences affect the images (Clift, et al., 1994, Calderhead, 1989). Personal identity as situated in one's biography and the resulting images and beliefs held about teaching are intertwined concepts. These beliefs, images, and sense of self as teacher play an important role in instructional and curricular decisions. Accessing and describing the self results in a variety of terms. For some researchers, utilizing the images used by teachers to describe the nature of their development (Elbaz, 1983; Clandinin & Connelley, 1984) has proved helpful. Although particular aspects belong to a shared social and occupational culture, these images are rooted in specific ways of perceiving the world (Nias, p. 14). Clandinin and Connelly (1988) describe images as "something within our experience, embodied in us as persons and expressed and enacted in our practices and actions... part of our past, called forth by situations in which we act in the present and are guides to our future" (p. 60). Powerful images held by preservice teachers about classrooms and teachers upon entering into teacher education programs have been documented (e.g., Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Lortie, 1975) and how these images mediate experiences in teacher education programs. Fenstermacher (1979) argued that one goal of teacher education is to help teachers examine their beliefs about teaching and learning into objectively reasonable or evidentiary beliefs.

Teacher Socialization

Few studies have addressed institutional effects of teacher education programs and subject specific courses (Giroux, 1981; Ginsburg, 1988; Popkewitz, 1985). Those that have (e.g., Griffin, 1989; Ross, 1987, 1988; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1982; Tabachnick, Popkewitz & Zeichner, 1980) report findings such as the importance of distinctions between program design and program implementation, the significance of a "reflexive" nature of teacher education programs in order for students to create a resiliency in institutional constraints and the role of students' personal beliefs about self and schooling. Studies addressing the effects of university coursework on preservice teachers propose that while coursework may have an immediate effect on prospective teachers' perspectives (Morine-Dershimer, 1989), students encounter difficulty transferring this new knowledge to classroom teaching (Hollingsworth, 1989; Ross, 1987, 1988). Another theme in this body of work is the insignificance that students credit their coursework (Clark et al., 1985; Smylie, 1989; Ginsburg & Newman, 1985). Although research does show the potential of the students' general views becoming more liberal as their program progressed (Su, 1990).

Feiman-Nemser (1990) examined preservice teachers' learning experiences during formal preparation. University coursework in this program did not provide enough to change pedagogical knowledge. Participants attempted to compensate for their limited knowledge by relying on their own schooling, textbooks, and practical experience in learning to

teach (Brown & Borko, 1992). Researchers concluded that preservice students couldn't be expected to analyze the knowledge and beliefs they draw upon in making instructional decisions.

Hollingsworth (1989) explored changes in conceptions of learning within a constructivist preservice teacher education program. Initial beliefs affected the changes in beliefs and that belief confrontation was aided by placing student teachers in classrooms in which the cooperating teachers held contrasting viewpoints.

Ginsburg & Clift (1990) suggest that the hidden curriculum of preservice programs represents the core of teacher socialization, suggesting that more direct studies of the formal and hidden curriculum of teacher education courses and ways in which the messages are received and interpreted by students are needed. Better understanding how individuals experience different responses to the same teacher education program, along with effects of different teacher education programs on preservice teacher socialization are two areas that may serve useful to the education community. In addition, more studies are needed that attend to the complex set of interactions existing among program features, dimensions of school contexts and individual classrooms as settings for learning to teach, along with the characteristics and dispositions that individual students bring to the experience

The previous theme centers on the larger institutional effects of teacher education programs on students in general, as a group. The second

theme, however, takes as its focus, the individual student and the issues raised by taking this perspective on learning to teach. The effects of students' prior beliefs and personal biographies as mediating factors in learning are repeatedly echoed in the literature. Bullough, et al. (1991) go so far as to state that in effect, persons socialize themselves; they are not "socialized", and that students' past experiences are essential knowledge if teacher education reform is to produce more than window dressing (p. 1). Crow (1988) documents that the teacher role identities brought into teacher education programs were still the major force for two teachers after three years of teaching.

These studies are just a few which suggest that research needs to go beyond content issues in teacher education program design to examining the underlying program values, role relationships, and other factors affecting learning to teach. Researchers need to pay attention to both the uniqueness and the commonalties in the socialization of teachers. Hollingsworth (1989) warns that if teacher educators remain loyal to more generic approaches to teacher education - valuing a single cultural view - this may contribute to the reproduction of existing instructional patterns, superficial learning, and promote learning to teach in a qualitatively different way (p. 187)

As the subsequent research questions emerged from the initial framework, we began to question the implicit understandings in the extant research on the meaning of learning to teach. It became clear in the data that how the language used by the preservice student for defining "learning to teach" had to be understood before attempting to understand his/her beliefs

about the teacher education experience. These student narratives might provide insight into the context of preservice teacher education and its relevance for personal inquiry and formal research (Tellez, 1996). Carter (1990) also addresses this discussion when she posed that "how one frames the learning to teach question depends a great deal on how one conceives of what is to be learned and how that learning might take place (p. 307)."

Context

This study was situated in the secondary education program where teaching majors split much of their time in content-specific methods courses in a particular college and time in Teachers College for field-based coursework.

The study took place in an experimental combination of required courses set in a 12-hour block called *The Professional Semester*. The stated purpose of the course was to provide a *critical* overview of curricular and instructional theory and practice in secondary schools. The stated course objectives were to:

- Begin the process of understanding your image of self as teacher.
- Develop an understanding of current thinking about teaching
- Develop an understanding of current local practice
- Become familiar with technology and telecommunications in relation to classroom teaching.
- Prepare lesson and unit plans integrating a variety of teaching strategies.
- Begin to develop a personal plan for future study prior to and after student teaching.
- Investigate the meaning of "community" in a democratic society as it applies to schooling.

> We will explore the philosophical, historical, social, and personal aspects of being a teacher. By emphasizing the interrelationships between such issues as equity, biography, and power in the teaching process, we hope that as students, you may discover that things are seldom simple and that there is a deep and sometimes surprising relationship between issues which seem to be entirely separate. (Course syllabus)

By simultaneously teaching and studying the course, the students and ourselves, we engaged in a form of action research. Data sources included: (a) course generated student work, (b) student journals, (c) formal and informal audiotaped student interviews, (d) classroom discussion, (e) field-based observations in local middle and high schools, and (f) e-mail discussions. Participants

The students in this course were primarily juniors. Their content included social studies, music, English, math, business, art, and technology education. The majority of these students are from the state and most from the surrounding areas. There were eight males and six females and all the students were Caucasian.

This study uses three major data sources. First, we interviewed each student twice, with each interview lasting for approximately one hour. I then transcribed each interview to a verbatim transcript and shared the resulting transcript with each student with the understanding that they would read and, if needed, request changes or edit the resulting transcripts. Questions in the interview protocol began in a "funnel-like" fashion, with initial questions asking for general demographic information, and each subsequent interview

iteration becoming more and more focused. Initial boundaries for the types of data to be generated were set by the choices of specific interview questions, yet the open-ended nature of the responses assured that these boundaries were not tightly formulated.

A second source of data was course-based journals. We used both traditional paper journals as well as electronic journals. The journal entries were one of the requirements for the course

The third source of data was informal discussions and other course generated materials. Some of these artifacts include course papers, e-mail, professional portfolio, and a personal web page.

Data are collected and analyzed according to qualitative research guidelines for grounded theory research and constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978), emphasizing, particularly their incremental approach to data gathering and analysis. A key to this approach is the idea of theoretical sampling, described as "the process of data collection whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes the data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop the theory as it emerges (p. 45). Analysis and data collection occur in a pulsating fashion – data collection, followed by analysis and theory development, more data collection, and then more analysis until research is (artificially) completed. Data collection and analysis are codependent and inherently symbiotic in interpretive analysis. Inductive analysis is shaped from the data rather than from preconceived theoretical frameworks. The development of

themes resulted from constructive analysis, a process of abstraction whereby units of analysis are derived from the "stream of behavior." (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The discovery of relationships begins with analysis of initial observations and undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process while feeding back into the process of category coding. This period of focused coding sorts the data to an analytic level rather than labels of topics. The development of themes resulted from insight gained during initial coding which then shaped the next iteration of data collection. Vertical coding of data by student followed by horizontal coding throughout the cohort of students resulted in a chronological definition of learning to teach over a semester's time. Table one indicates the timetable of data collection.

Table 1

Timetable of Data Collection

Method of Data Collection	When?	How often?
Formal interviews	September 1997 November 1997	Twice
Journals	August 1997- December 1997	Weekly
Informal conversations/ e-mail messages	August 1997- December 1997	Weekly

Results and Discussion

The results from this project can be artificially separated into issues of *content* and *methodology*. The content issues are related to the definitions of learning to teach articulated by the students. What follows are the definitions of learning to teach for four students followed by a discussion of issues raised by these definitions along with others.

September	I think a teacher is a person that explains different subjects to a person. An educator, is someone that is educating more than just people in a classroom. I have a discrepancy between teacher and educator. My goal is to teach not just people in my classroom, to teach somebody anything about music. I had gone through just calling myself a teacher, but I kind of realized that some people want to teach a subject. I want to educate the people. I don't want to just teach a classroom, I want to be able to teach the parents of those children, the administration, the community, and the people around me. So, in my goal to become an educator, I've gone to conventions. I was on the Indiana Professional Standard Board.
October	Learning to teach is a process that starts when a young student wants to become a teacher up to the point that they have become an educator. The beginning of this process is one teacher learning from another. Doing observations as a teacher in training is a good start. Student teaching begins soon after the observing process. Here the new teacher learns the "tricks" of the trade and incorporates the previous knowledge gathered from schooling. Hopefully, the new teacher will continue to learn and try to become better in order to transition into a good. The first year on the job is where people learn the most. After the first year, the young teacher (or educator by now) has learned to teach but will have to improve and keep up with new developments
November	I have obtained the knowledge I need to have in order to teach music. I have received the training I needed to become the educator I want to be. I have had many experiences that were outside of the "teaching program" that have taught me the most. I do not credit the teaching program for educating me. It was a combination of the program with curiosity, ambition, fear, and dedication. I have really grown as an educator and hope to in the future
December	Learning to teach is not learned from a mere textbook, one person, or a class- it is from experience and a love for teaching. From this point on, learning, or improving, to teach is a self-educated process.

Student #12

September	I don't think someone can actually teach you to be a teacher, I think you have to have a gut instinct on how to be a good teacher, You can teach different principles, but in learning to be a teacher, I think that comes from your surrounding or your environment.
October	I think "learning to teach" is difficult to define. I honestly don't think you can really learn to teach. To me, teaching comes from a gut instinct. I do think you can learn methods and techniques, but you don't know if these work until you actually try them in class. I think the best way to learn to teach is to actually observe a classroom or participate.
November	I think I have grown a great deal throughout the teacher education program. I would put myself at either a 6 or a 7 (on a scale of 10 on where they saw themselves in their growth of teacher). I know I have a lot to learn still as I continue through the program.
December	I think it is also becoming aware of the many issues facing children of all ages today and learning to adapt your style of teaching and yourself to the issues and problems. I still also believe that you can't actually "learn to teach." You can learn techniques, but I still think it comes naturally to you.

Student #11

September	I have no idea!. One thing that I learned through this class, is what it really takes to be a teacher. It's not just showing up everyday and opening the book and just reading out of it. Learning to teach is developing yourself, in a way that you can make an impact on other people through your knowledge, and at the same time, you're willing to take someone else's knowledge and at least consider it, or to incorporate it into what you do. I don't know how to explain it.
October	Learning to teach is a process of developing skills, strategies, and techniques that a preservice teacher can use in a classroom to be their most effective and the application of these skills, strategies, and techniques in the (real) classroom setting. I think that when someone is learning to teach the most important and influential aspect of this learning is the actual teaching (student, participation, tutoring) experience. In our classes we are taught skills, strategies, and techniques to aid us in being the most effective teacher and to meet the various needs of the students. However, with all this information we are provided it means nothing if you can't apply it in an actual classroom setting. The actual experience of teaching (student, participation, tutoring) is a valuable and important part of someone's learning to teach. The experience molds the person into being the teacher they will (probably) be for the rest of their teaching careers
November	When I started at the middle school, I had no idea of the experience I was about to become involved in. At that time I might have been a 3 or 4. Now, I've met challenges and obstacles in the classroom and I can handle them and apply what I've learned from real teaching in a classroom to deal with unexpected (unplanned) occurrences. I was given the opportunity to go in the classroom and jump in feet first not knowing what to expect. And after I was finished with class each day I had someone there to give me advice and help me improve my methods.
December	Learning to teach is teaching to learn to be a teacher. Developing skills and methods that you can use for all situations. Learning to teach means that you never stop learning how to teach.

Student #10

September	I think the role of teacher's changing, from what it used to be. Whether you like it or not, you're kind of a role model. That's part of the reason why I did it, I think, or the reason I chose to be a teacher is because I think it's so important. Learning to teach learning your content area first. You need to learn how to teach in different ways, like we've been talking about in class. If we can't communicate, we can't expect the kids to learn. They're supposed to mold us, put us in the mindframe of being a teacher, teaching us the skills. That's why I'm looking forward to going out there. What I hope to get out of it is confidence that I can do this what I get out of it.
October	I think that "learning to teach" is a lot more complicated than what it sounds like. It entails learning how others might learn and the behaviors that may or may not accompany that learning style. I have found this process of learning to teach very rewarding. It's kind of nice to know what it feels like on the other side of the desk. Another part of learning how to teach is knowing how to communicate effectively. You have to know how to relay your messages in a manner that which others can learn from. You can't be shy when you're learning to teach
November	If I had to pick a number, I guess I would pick a 6 or 7. I feel that I could not pick a 10 because I am not a full-blown teacher. I still feel very unsure of my teaching capabilities, probably because I feel that I have not had a lot of practice at this. I think that I have done that a lot in my life so far, underestimating my abilities and doubting myself in important situations. I don't think I can choose an 8 or 9 because some thing tells me you gain those "numbers" while doing student teaching. What teachers have over student teacher and participants is that they help adapt textbooks, plan and adapt curriculums, and serve on committees and deal more with the public. Being a "10" is no stopping point, though. Then, I will have to continue to change, adapt, and improve to keep the "10" status. My desire then will be to be a teacher not just because I have a license, but by choice. I hope I love what I do.
December	My definition of learning to teach is a person becoming knowledgeable in their subject area and attaining the capability to effectively pass that knowledge on through varied styles and methods. This also means that one who teaches should be able to adapt to different learning and teaching environments so that they can utilize their talents to the fullest.

Student #4

I artificially separate the results from the study into issues of *content* and *methodology*. The content issues are related to the definitions of learning to teach articulated by the students. I address two content issues which emerged from the data: (a) Lack of theoretical framework and (b) Language of learning to teach. Next I raise issues related to the methodologies of reflection.

Lack of theoretical framework

This study took place just before university-wide reform efforts related to performance-based teacher education. Since that time, faculty in Teachers College along with faculty in the arts and sciences are redefining teacher education on campus. This redefinition has been in response, in part, to attempts to incorporate content and developmental standards written by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) which serve as the framework for what novice teachers should know and be able to do. Consequently, the language used currently to discuss teacher education is clearly defined and limited primarily to demonstrating competency language stated in these standards. In contrast, the language of learning to teach used by the students in this study is indistinct in relation to any specific theoretical paradigm for teaching and learning. Learning to teach for these students appears to be an individualistic endeavor with no "shaping effects" from the institution. If their program did offer a consistent message of "learning to teach", it did not appear in their language.

In their study of one teacher education program 's messages sent to students, Eisenhart & Behm (1991) report that:

> If a cultural system (the body of knowledge presented) is amorphous or ambiguous, if institutional arrangements do not support practices mostly consistent with the cultural system or if there is insufficient time to learn the system and its practices, then those who complete the rite of passage are unlikely to leave it with a clear sense either of a body of professional knowledge or of an identity within the system. ..... it is to suggest if they can be exposed to a more explicit and consistent set of experiences and one that is sensitive to their needs as novices, we would expect them to leave the program with a clearer view of the identities they are striving for (p. 18).

Findings that emerged from The Teacher Education and Learning to Teach (TELT) study also suggest that content and orientation of programs is more likely to influence teacher learning (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Zeichner, & Liston, 1990).

Language of learning to teach

The four data points described were given throughout the semester in response to the question, *"What does it mean to learn to teach?"* Students had difficulty separating *learning to teach* with the concepts of *teaching and teacher*. These students either negated *learning to teach* or viewed this process as equivalent to *teaching* and/or *teacher*. If, as discussed earlier, these students saw themselves as "prepackaged" it follows that they might have difficulty defining learning to teach. (Tom Bird - "warrant to teach"). Most of their definitions are highly fragmented and better describe their definition of "teacher" and "teaching".

Definitions are refined throughout the semester but do not address learning to teach as a distinct phenomena. Further, the descriptions do not include reference to themselves as agents in the process at all. The language Student #11 uses to define learning to teach is problematic on many levels. The essentialist references to growth as *instinct and natural* may bind and mediate her experiences as student. For many of the other students, learning to teach is undefinable as an area of study. There was clearly no institutional language (shared understanding) of what this process entails.

Early in our analysis, the term "prepackagedness" emerged as a way to describe an overall sense of readiness these students portrayed. A reminder that these data were collected during a first field experience course. Many of the students were planning on student teaching a year from this time. Student 10 and student 12's definitions of learning to teach in November indicates this self-perceived readiness. Except for a few students, this theme occurs throughout all student definitions.

Returning to the suggestion by Carter (1990) that how one frames the learning to teach question depends a great deal on how one conceives of what is to be learned and how that learning might take place, is disconcerting in relation to these data.

The Methodology of Reflection

The reference above to the artificial division of content and methodology is due to insight early on in the analysis that *how* we ask preservice students to verbalize abstract, complex, possibly ethereal, and

certainly fragile understandings of the learning to teach process affects *what* they tell us. While this phenomena of social science research is not new, it is an important factor in the creation of teacher education programs committed to conceptual change in that we must access student understandings of learning to teach brought to us by our students. This study helps us understand this as a methodological process by asking us to revisit the ways in which scholars attempt to capture important yet fragile concepts such as reflection, change, and personal growth in teacher education courses.

If, as stated earlier, language creates a particular view of reality and of the self as well as serving as a repository of human interests, we need to further access preservice students' understanding of learning to teach in parallel with our own.

Phenomenology as a framework

To help make sense of this, I turned to Van Manen (1990) and his notion of frameworks for studying specific human phenomena. He writes that phenomenology is less concerned with the facticity of the psychological, sociological, or cultural peculiarities or differences of the meaning structures of human experience. (p. 40). Capturing a person's lived experience, in this case learning to teach, cannot be understood in its immediate manifestation but only reflectively as past presence. If this is so, what does it mean for studies, like this one, that collect data with preservice students in the moment of learning to teach? We asked students to be aware of their

experience as they experienced it. What might their definitions of learning to teach be today? Is that important to know? Van Manen suggests that:

> Phenomenological concern always has a twofold character: a preoccupation with both the concreteness (the ontic) as well as the essential nature (the ontological) of a lived experience.(p. 40)

I struggle with what appears to be a dichotomy of purpose. The aim of phenomenology is to transform lived experience into a textual expression of its essence. However, Van Manen raises the issue of the epistemology of language and text when he states:

> We must not forget that human actions and experiences are precisely that: actions and experiences. To reduce the whole word to text and to treat all experience textually is to be forgetful of the metaphoric origin of one's methodology (p. 39).

The evidence of scholarship for educational researchers is the written text – the ontic – yet we struggle to textualize the ontological reflective "lived experience". What then does our text represent? What epistemological standing does it have particularly when programmatic changes are made from similar data?

No single, unifying theory of teacher education exists today (p. 3)
The analytical tools of the anthropologist can provide insight into the problem of what constructs to use in teacher ed. programs. Nine universal cultural patterns were described by anthropologist Melville J. Herskovits, and all schools and classrooms exhibit them. All cultures have:

1. A value system. In teacher ed., effectiveness and quality control are regarded as core values.
2. A cosmology or world view that identifies beliefs about the position of man in the cosmos.
3. A form of social organization that governs relationships.
4. A technology, body of knowledge, and skills used to perform the tasks necessary for the system to survive and function (phonics, etc.).
5. An economic system to regulate the allocation of goods and services.
6. A form of governance or a political system regulating behavior.
7. A special language
8. An aesthetic system that defines what is beautiful, creative, and artistic.
9. A socialization or educational process that regularizes the transmission of knowledge.

Schwartz, H. (1996). The Changing Nature of Teacher Education. In J. Sikula (Ed.)

References

Carter, K. (1990). Teacher's knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1986). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as "personal" in studies of the personal? Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19(6), 487-500.

Eisenhart, M., & Behm, L. (1991). Learning to teach: Developing expertise or rite of passage? Journal of Education for Teaching, 17, 1, pp. 51-72.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. pp. 212-223. New York: Macmillan.

Floden, R. & Buchmann, M. (1990). Philosophical Inquiry in Teacher Education. In R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Green, T. (1971). The activities of teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grossman, P., Wilson, S., & Shulman, L. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), Knowledge base for the beginning teacher, pp. 23-36. New York: Pergamon Press.

Huling-Austin, L. (1992). Research on learning to teach: Implications for teacher induction and mentoring programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 3, p. 173.

Johnston, S. (1994). Experience is the best teacher; or is it? An analysis of the role of experience in learning to teach. Journal of Teacher Education, 45, 3, 1pp. 99-209.

Kuzmic, J. (1993). A beginning teacher's search for meaning: teacher socialization, organizational literacy, and empowerment. Teaching and Teacher Education, 10, 1 pp.15-27.

Munby, H. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. Journal of Teacher Education, 45, 2, p. 86.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.),Handbook of Qualitative Research (pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, pp. 102-102-119. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Tellez, K. (1996). Authentic Assessment. In J. Sikula, (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (pp. 704-721. New York: Macmillan.

Thompson, A. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In D. Grouws (Ed.), Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning, pp. 127-146. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Macmillan: New York.

Van Manen, M. (1990). Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an action sensitive pedagogy. London: State University of New York.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 130-178.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1990). Traditions of reform in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41 (2), 3-20.